Northern District of California

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	4

MADISON ARDGALL,

Plaintiff,

v.

CITY OF SAUSALITO, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. <u>22-cv-04722-EMC</u>

ORDER GRANTING PLAINTIFF'S APPLICATION TO PROCEED *IN* FORMA PAUPERIS. AND DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR A TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Docket Nos. 2-3

Currently pending before the Court is Ms. Ardgall's application to proceed in forma pauperis and her motion for a temporary restraining order ("TRO") and preliminary injunction.

The Court has reviewed Ms. Ardgall's financial affidavit. Based on that affidavit, it **GRANTS** her application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Furthermore, because Ms. Ardgall has raised a claim implicating Martin v. Boise, 920 F.3d 584 (9th Cir. 2019), the Court orders the U.S. Marshals Office to serve her summons and complaint on Defendants.

Turning to Ms. Ardgall's motion for a TRO and a preliminary injunction, the Court denies the request for relief but without prejudice. The Court is not unsympathetic to Ms. Ardgall's situation. She appears to have health problems, including a bad leg. However, Ms. Ardgall does not have a constitutional claim simply because Defendants did not provide her housing or help finding housing. To the extent Ms. Ardgall is concerned that she will be arrested for unlawful daytime or overnight camping pursuant to Resolution No. 6009, the Court notes that she has not been arrested nor does there appear to be any threat that she will be arrested.

That being said, the City and its agents should be mindful of the holding in Martin v. Boise -i.e., "an ordinance violates the Eighth Amendment insofar as it imposes criminal sanctions

Case 3:22-cv-04722-EMC Document 10 Filed 08/23/22 Page 2 of 2

United States District Court

against homeless individuals for sleeping outdoors, on public property, when no alternative shelter is available to them." *Id.* at 604.

For the foregoing reasons, the Court **DENIES** the motion for a temporary restraining order and preliminary injunction, but without prejudice.

This order disposes of Docket Nos. 2 and 3.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 23, 2022

EDWARD M. CHEN United States District Judge